

GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP
 GERALD M. GORDON
 Nevada Bar No. 229
 E-mail: ggordon@gtg.legal
 WILLIAM M. NOALL
 Nevada Bar No. 3549
 E-mail: wnoall@gtg.legal
 GABRIELLE A. HAMM
 Nevada Bar No. 11588
 E-mail: ghamm@gtg.legal
 7251 Amigo St., Suite 210
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
 Tel: (725) 777-3000 / Fax: (725) 777-3112

MICHAEL D. NAPOLI, ESQ.
Pro hac vice
 AKERMAN LLP
 2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 3600
 Dallas, Texas 75201
 Tel: (214) 720-4360 / Fax: (214) 720-8116
 Email: michael.napoli@akerman.com
 ARIEL E. STERN, ESQ.
 Nevada Bar No. 8276
 AKERMAN LLP
 1635 Village Center Circle, Suite 200
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
 Tel: (702) 634-5000 / Fax: (702) 380-8572
 Email: ariel.stern@akerman.com

*Attorneys for Tecumseh–Infinity Medical
 Receivable Fund, LP*

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

In re:
 INFINITY CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC.
dba INFINITY HEALTH CONNECTIONS,
 Debtor.

Case No. 21-14486-abl

Chapter 7

HASELECT-MEDICAL RECEIVABLES
 LITIGATION FINANCE FUND
 INTERNATIONAL SP,

Adversary Case No. 21-01167-abl

Plaintiff,

**TECUMSEH-INFINITY MEDICAL
 RECEIVABLES FUND, LP’S SECOND
AMENDED¹ ANSWER AND
 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
 TRUSTEE’S COUNTERCLAIM**

v.

TECUMSEH–INFINITY MEDICAL
 RECEIVABLES FUND, LP,

Defendant.

TECUMSEH–INFINITY MEDICAL
 RECEIVABLES FUND, LP,

Counter-Claimant,

v.

HASELECT-MEDICAL RECEIVABLES
 LITIGATION FINANCE FUND
 INTERNATIONAL SP; ROBERT E.

¹ This document has been amended to reflect the correct case caption.

1	ATKINSON, CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE
2	Counter-Defendants.
3	ROBERT E. ATKINSON, CHAPTER 7
4	TRUSTEE,
5	Counter-Claimant,
6	v.
7	TECUMSEH-INFINITY MEDICAL
8	RECEIVABLES FUND, LP,
	Counter-Defendant.

Defendant Tecumseh–Infinity Medical Receivables Fund LP (“Tecumseh” or “Counter Defendant”) submits its Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Counterclaim Plaintiff Robert E. Atkinson, Chapter 7 Trustee’s (“Trustee” or “Counter Plaintiff”) *Counterclaim against Tecumseh-Infinity Medical Receivables Fund, LP* (the “Counterclaim”) (ECF No. 32).

ANSWER

1. Paragraph 1 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 1 of the Counterclaim are denied.

2. Paragraph 2 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 2 of the Counterclaim are denied.

3. Paragraph 3 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 3 of the Counterclaim are denied.

4. Paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim are denied.

5. Tecumseh admits the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Counterclaim.

6. Tecumseh admits the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Counterclaim.

7. Tecumseh admits the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Counterclaim.

1 8. Tecumseh admits the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Counterclaim.

2 9. Tecumseh denies the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Counterclaim.

3 10. Tecumseh denies the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the Counterclaim.

4 11. Paragraph 11 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a
5 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 11 of the Counterclaim
6 are denied.

7 12. The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for
8 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 12 of the
9 Counterclaim.

10 13. The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for
11 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 13 of the
12 Counterclaim.

13 14. The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for
14 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 14 of the
15 Counterclaim.

16 15. The Sub-Advisory Agreement speaks for itself. Tecumseh denies any remaining
17 allegations set forth in paragraph 14 of the Counterclaim.

18 16. The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for
19 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 16 of the
20 Counterclaim.

21 17. The documents are not attached to the Counterclaim and otherwise speak for
22 themselves. Tecumseh denies any remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 17 of the
23 Counterclaim.

24 18. Tecumseh denies that the Debtor has the right to receive payment on any of the
25 Tecumseh Receivables.² Tecumseh denies all remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 18 of
26 the Counterclaim.

27 _____
28 ² Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein will take on the meaning ascribed to them in
Tecumseh's Counterclaim (ECF No. 26).

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

19. The responses set forth above are realleged and reaverred as if fully set forth herein.

20. Paragraph 20 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 20 of the Counterclaim are denied.

21. Paragraph 21 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 21 of the Counterclaim are denied.

22. Paragraph 22 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 22 of the Counterclaim are denied.

23. Paragraph 23 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 23 of the Counterclaim are denied.

24. Paragraph 24 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 24 of the Counterclaim are denied.

25. Paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim are denied.

26. Tecumseh denies the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the Counterclaim.

27. Paragraph 27 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 27 of the Counterclaim are denied.

28. Paragraph 28 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 28 of the Counterclaim are denied.

29. Paragraph 29 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a

1 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 29 of the Counterclaim
2 are denied.

3 30. Paragraph 30 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a
4 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 30 of the Counterclaim
5 are denied.

6 31. Paragraph 31 of the Counterclaim is a legal conclusion that does not require a
7 response. To the extent a response is required, the allegations in paragraph 31 of the Counterclaim
8 are denied.

9 32. Tecumseh denies that Trustee is entitled to any relief relating to the disputed
10 receivables at issue, and expressly denies each and every assertion in the ‘wherefore’ clause found
11 below Paragraph 32 of the Trustee’s Counterclaim.

12 33. Each and every allegation not specifically admitted herein is hereby denied.

13 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

14 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

15 The Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Tecumseh Receivables which are not
16 property of the chapter 7 bankruptcy estate.

17 **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

18 The Tecumseh Receivables are not property of the Debtor’s estate and therefore are not
19 subject to the Trustee’s strong-arm powers under 11 U.S.C. § 544(a).

20 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

21 The Debtor possesses nothing more than bare legal title of Tecumseh Receivables as a
22 purchase money resulting trust existed by operation of law pre-petition under South Carolina, by
23 which Tecumseh Receivables were held in trust by Debtor for the benefit of Tecumseh, as provider
24 of the purchase monies. The strong arm power of 11 U.S.C. § 544 “could not make the corpus of
25 a valid resulting trust property of the bankruptcy debtor.” *In re Torrez*, 63 B.R. 751, 755 (B.A.P.
26 9th Cir. 1986), *aff’d*, 827 F.2d 1299 (9th Cir. 1987) (“[u]nder California law a resulting trust is
27 implied by operation of law whenever a party pays the purchase price for a parcel of land and
28 places the title to that land in the name of another”); *see also Cage v. Kang (In re Kang)*, 2013

1 Bankr. LEXIS 844 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. Mar. 7, 2013) (resulting trust under Texas law prevails over
2 section 544(a)(3)).

3 **FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

4 Tecumseh was properly perfected prior to the Debtor's bankruptcy, and as such its interest
5 in the Tecumseh Receivables may not be attacked under § 544(a).

6 Dated: February 2, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

7 GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP

8 By: /s/ Gabrielle A. Hamm

9 Gerald M. Gordon, Esq.

10 William M. Noall, Esq.

Gabrielle A. Hamm, Esq.

7251 Amigo St., Suite 210

11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

12 and

13 MICHAEL D. NAPOLI, ESQ.

14 *Pro hac vice*

AKERMAN LLP

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 3600

15 Dallas, Texas 75201

16 Tel: (214) 720-4360 / Fax: (214) 720-8116

17 ARIEL E. STERN, ESQ.

18 Nevada Bar No. 8276

AKERMAN LLP

1635 Village Center Circle, Suite 200

19 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

20 Tel: (702) 634-5000 / Fax: (702) 380-8572

21 Email: ariel.stern@akerman.com

22 *Attorneys for Tecumseh-Infinity Medical*
23 *Receivable Fund, LP*

24 4872-1853-1339, v. 1